

the truth not from our own administration but from an ally. The truth should come from the White House and not Downing Street.

More than anything else, what America hopes to hear from the President tonight is the unvarnished truth of what is really going on in Iraq, how he plans to put a new strategy in place and assure success. He needs to clearly articulate our goals, the benchmarks for measuring progress, and the game plan to win. When President Bush addresses the Nation tonight, all of us hope he will state a new and more realistic and more effective strategy for the United States to succeed in Iraq.

Our current strategy is not worthy of the sacrifices our men and women in uniform are making. The war has clearly made America less safe in the world. It has strengthened the support for al-Qaida and made it harder to win the real war against terrorism, the war against al-Qaida.

The President needs an effective strategy to accelerate the training of a capable Iraqi security force. The President needs an effective strategy to rescue the faltering reconstruction effort, create new jobs, new hope for the Iraqi people, and neutralize the temptation to join the insurgents. The President needs an effective strategy to bring the international community into Iraq and to achieve the adoption on schedule of a constitution that protects all the people of Iraq. He needs an effective strategy to give our troops the equipment they need to fight the war and to ensure that veterans returning from Iraq have access to the quality health care services they so richly deserve. He needs an effective strategy to repair the damage the war has caused to our military and to our reputation in the world.

Realism is hard medicine to swallow. President Bush must face the facts and accept them. Our men and women in uniform deserve no less. Our strategy is not working, and I hope the President will outline a winning strategy this evening.

SUPREME COURT

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, on another matter, we all wish the very best to Chief Justice Rehnquist. He has made the quality of the Federal courts the special mission of his leadership, and the Nation and judiciary are grateful for that leadership. Hopefully, he will continue to serve as long as he wishes and is able.

In the event of a resignation, a new Justice should be someone who is committed to the rule of law and the rights and freedoms of all Americans and can therefore win broad support in the Senate and the Nation. Like many Presidents before him, the President can easily choose such a nominee if he follows the constitutional requirement that he obtain the Senate's advice as well as its consent. I hope President Bush chooses the path of consultation

and consensus and not the path of confrontation and conflict.

The Constitution requires the Senate to be an independent check on the President, especially in protecting the independence and fairness of our judges. The Founders very deliberately made the appointment of Federal judges a shared responsibility of the Senate and the President. It is ridiculous for some on the other side to claim that the Founders would not have wanted such consultation to occur. In fact, the Founders came within a hair's breath of assigning the entire responsibility for appointing judges to the Senate. It was a last-minute compromise at the Constitutional Convention in Philadelphia in 1787 that gave the responsibility to the President but only with the advice and consent of the Senate.

As the chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee has clearly pointed out, the advice function is as important as the consent function in the exercise of the shared power of the President and the Senate in appointing judges and Justices. Presidents all the way back to George Washington and right up to Bill Clinton have consulted with the Senate on Supreme Court nominations, and when they have done so the result has been a better Supreme Court.

The wise procedure was made even more explicit in the memorandum of understanding written by the 14 Senators from both parties last month when they urged the President to consult with Members of both parties in the Senate. Why are some of our Republican colleagues in the Senate so opposed to such consultation? Do they fear that if the President seeks the advice of a broad range of Senators, he may be persuaded to make a consensus nomination to the Supreme Court? Are they against consensus? Do they see the Supreme Court nominations merely as political footballs in their political games? Before any person can be appointed to the Federal court, the Senate and the President have to agree that the person will be best for the whole country, not just for a narrow ideological and radical faction.

Some Presidents have ignored the requirement to obtain the advice of the Senate, but no President can avoid the requirement to obtain the consent of the Senate. I certainly hope President Bush will not heed those who think consultation and consensus are obsolete. Whether the confirmation process goes smoothly will be determined by the President's selection.

He can pick judges with us as the Founders wanted or he can pick fights with us as some of his political advisers and Senate friends seem to want.

The President's choice is clear. He could follow the Constitution and seek the advice of the Senate before he makes a nomination. If he does that, the confirmation process is more likely to be expeditious, constructive, and a unifying force for the entire Nation. Or

he can listen only to the advice of the fringe factions of his own party, people so extreme they have even called for the impeachment of six of the current nine Justices because those Justices refuse to bow to the ideological dictates of the rightwing. If he does that, the confirmation process will be divisive and corrosive and likely unsuccessful. There are hundreds if not thousands of excellent lawyers and judges who could be consensus choices for the Supreme Court, and Senators will help the President find them if he seeks our advice. If he takes our bipartisan advice, he will have no trouble obtaining our bipartisan consent.

The next person who serves on the Supreme Court will not just serve for the remainder of the Bush administration. The lives and freedoms and rights of our children and our grandchildren may well be directly affected by the decisions of that Justice in the coming decades. For their sake and the Nation's sake we cannot accept a choice based on partisan politics or ideological agendas. What the Court and the Nation need is a demonstrated commitment to the rule of law and the basic values of our Constitution. I urge President Bush to listen to a respected former Republican, Senator John Danforth:

If he truly wants to appoint a conservative he should make sure it is a judicial conservative, someone who is going to apply the law, not his political or philosophical beliefs.

PRESIDENT BUSH'S IRAQ STATEMENT

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, tonight, as we all know, President Bush is going to speak to the Nation about the situation in Iraq. I think that we all have a pretty good sense of much of what he is going to say. He will talk, as he should, about the extraordinary courage of our troops across the world; he will talk, as he should, about the march of democracy; and he will speak with pride about Iraqi elections and the end of tyranny. He will stress, as we all share, the importance of the war on terror. All of us in this Chamber stand in awe of the courage of our troops and all of us in this Chamber and in this country are passionate about democracy. But the fact is that honoring our troops and extolling the virtue of democracy, those words alone are not going to be enough to improve the situation and the reality of the perilous direction that we are currently headed in Iraq. What we need are not just the words extolling the virtues of things with which we all agree. What we need is a policy that is going to address the complex and in some ways self-inflicted predicament that we face today. The best way to honor troops, Mr. President, the best way to protect our troops, is to provide them with the best policy possible. The fact is that that is not what we have today. Yesterday, I attended the funeral of Christopher Piper of Marblehead, MA, special

forces, who died of wounds from an IED, and two other of his fellow soldiers died previously in that same incident. The overwhelming outpouring of emotion and patriotism—kids holding flags along the sides of the streets, people, good citizens, patriots all, coming out to say goodbye to their native son—was moving beyond words.

Christopher Piper, and all of the soldiers like him currently serving and all those who will go over there, deserve a Government leadership that makes the best decisions possible to be able to provide them the greatest security possible to accomplish the mission as rapidly and effectively as possible.

Today, I regret to say, the experience in Iraq has proven again and again to America and the world that we have no realistic comprehensive strategy to reduce the risks to our soldiers and to achieve our goals. While our military has done—and continues to do—a superb job, our civilian leadership has not, and our soldiers are paying the price every single day. It is time for a realistic plan for success.

To achieve that plan, we have to begin by tearing down the wall of arrogance. When the Vice President absurdly claims the insurgency is in its last throes, it insults the common sense and intelligence of the American people, and he diminishes our stature in the world. How can we expect the Iraqi people to take us seriously and do their part when the White House says the insurgency is fading, and yet Iraqis live in constant fear—explosions waking them up in the night, reminding them of the danger inherent in a short walk to work or to school the next morning.

I know that we should not dwell on mistakes. We need to understand, however, the consequences of the decisions we have made and our ability to effectively move forward because the only way you can move forward and have a comprehensive strategy is to understand where you have been. With allies reading the Downing Street memo and the American people increasingly aware that the rationalization for war changed midstream, it now becomes that much harder to rally the collective strength of the Nation and the world to our cause.

We have to acknowledge the past in order to overcome it because the truth is that, until this moment, the stubbornness of this administration has made a difference. It hurts our chances for success. It leads to frustrated expectations of Americans themselves. It makes it much more difficult for the Iraqi people to embrace the cause, and it makes it so much easier for sidelined nations to turn their back on a common interest and say: OK, it is their deal, let them go solve it because they don't seem to understand it.

The bottom line is that when it comes to war and the safety of American troops, there is no time for excuses. All of our troops deserve the best we can provide, and they deserve

it now. This is the time for the administration to tell the truth about what is happening on the ground and be open to new ideas about how we are going to get the job done. Admitting mistakes is a necessary hurdle and a constructive tool for this administration if it wants to build the strength necessary to get it right in Iraq. Admitting mistakes paves the way for elected officials and the American people to come together and to move forward. Admitting mistakes actually lays the groundwork for the climate of cooperation that allows allies to add to our strength. Admitting mistakes eases the concerns of the Iraqi people and helps us make them understand that there will be no success unless they embrace the burden of their own future. And that includes acknowledging that Iraq today is something that it was not before the war—a breeding ground for jihadists. Today, there are 16,000 to 20,000 insurgents, and the number of jihadists among them is growing, according to our own estimates. So this is a growing challenge, and we need to take immediate steps to address it. Our officer corps reports that every time our troops kill or capture an insurgent, there are three more who just step forward to take his place. That is not a compelling strategy for success.

So I hope that tonight we hear something new from the President. I hope the President will recognize that the American people demand more than a communications strategy—they demand real leadership, with real decisions and real choices that provide a strategy for success and that get our troops home. If the President does this, he will begin to restore the confidence of the American people and the respect of the world. In showing real leadership, he will make it clear to the Iraqi people that it is time for them to take the lead.

I also hope the American people understand that there still can be a plan for success in Iraq if we move quickly, if we make the right choices, if we reach across the aisle for bipartisan effort, if we reach out to other nations. The mistakes that we have made do not change the fact that our military is the most powerful and competent in the world and that democracy is one of the world's most powerful ideas. The mistakes do not change the fact that the Iraqi people understand, through the powerful memory of generations, that they have a unique opportunity to shape their own future. If the President finally opens to these new ideas and gets this right, tells the truth about the complex challenge, and the Iraqi people get serious about doing their part and bearing the burden, we can have the success that we need and seek in Iraq.

So what can the President say tonight to get things right in Iraq and put us on the road to success? The President can start by immediately declaring that the United States does not seek permanent bases or any perma-

nent military presence in Iraq. Erasing suspicion of indefinite occupation is critical to eroding support for the insurgency. Getting that right also means using the extraordinary leverage that we have to get the Iraqis to do their part. Our massive military presence is all that stands between the Iraqi people and complete chaos. Our special forces are protecting Iraqi leaders. With this kind of leverage, it is nothing short of shocking that the administration allowed 6 months to go by from the last election before including Sunnis in the political process. This was an obvious crucial prerequisite to success.

Yet there was no sense of urgency and minimal pressure applied. It is time for the administration to use its leverage to insist that the Iraqis do their part and establish a truly inclusive political process and meet the deadlines for finishing the Constitution and holding new elections in December. There can be no wavering from those dates.

Getting it right also means putting together a real plan for training Iraqi troops and following through on it. This should be our top priority. It is the key to getting our troops home and avoiding a humiliating withdrawal. It is time to move beyond fudging the numbers and finally put the training of Iraqi troops on a true 6-month wartime footing. That includes ensuring that the Iraqi Government has the full budget necessary to be able to deploy and continue the training.

It is also time to stop using the in-country training requirement as an excuse for refusing offers made by Egypt, Jordan, France, and Germany to do more. Why would we turn down the opportunity of other countries to help us do more? Why would we turn down the opportunity to be able to give our troops the relief they deserve?

Getting it right also means drawing up a detailed plan—a real plan, shared with the Congress of the United States—with the clear milestone of transfer of military and police responsibilities to the Iraqis after the December elections.

The administration's plan should take into account both political and security objectives, including Iraqi force structure and capacity, and it should be specifically tied to a series of specific tasks and responsibilities. This plan must have more than just dates and numbers. It must make it clear to the Iraqi Government that American patience is limited.

The Iraqi people need to understand that in America, today, when we see Army recruitments suffering, families organizing to protect their kids from recruiters, and when we see the divorce rate for military officers skyrocketing—I am told the divorce rate among officers for the last year is up some 70-plus percent; and since the year 2000, up over 300 percent—when we see this kind of damage to the long-term capacity of the American military, we need to take it seriously. I

know the Iraqi people already understand that our troops are skilled and brave. Now they need to understand we must see legitimate progress that offers a real chance of American troops beginning to come home.

At the same time, if the administration wants the Iraqis to bear the burden, they need to move beyond the hollow "stay as long as it takes no matter what" talk that provides an endless security blanket—a disincentive for Iraqis to stand up for Iraq—and, instead, they must talk forcefully about the transfer of responsibility.

If the administration gets this plan right, and the Iraqis succeed in adopting a new constitution and holding elections as planned, trained Iraqi security forces should be ready to take on more responsibility at the critical moment when support for the insurgency is diminishing. That is the kind of careful, strategic planning we need to set the stage for American forces to be able to be reduced in number, as the Iraqi security forces assume more of the mission. But, again, this simply will not happen unless the Iraqi forces themselves assume more of their part. We must make the Iraqi Government understand the patience of America is finite, and that real progress must be achieved. We all understand that deploying capable Iraqi security forces is imperative to success. It always has been imperative to success. Yet the numbers we have been given again and again have been false. But the administration would also have us believe Iraqi forces alone could end the insurgency. That is simply not true. I hope the President strikes a different tone tonight and commits to work simultaneously, equally, forcefully on all fronts—security, economic, and political.

The administration should know by now that overly optimistic predictions for Iraq and rebuilding Iraq have actually been a drag on our mission. Reconstruction lags behind even in the Shiite south and in the Kurdish north, where security is far less of an issue. This sends the wrong message to those whom we ask to sacrifice for freedom.

We need to speed up work in these areas in order to demonstrate that progress will be made in the rest of Iraq. If Iraqis, particularly Sunnis, who fear being left out in the cold, see electricity flowing, jobs being created, infrastructure being built, and a government of their own choosing being formed, the lure of the insurgency will diminish. The violence and risk to our troops will decrease. To get it right in Iraq, we must show all Iraqis they are fighting not only for a future of freedom but for a tangibly improved future for their lives on a day-to-day basis, and for their children.

Getting it right also means understanding the neighborhood. It means getting those with an interest in Iraq, such as the Saudis, to act now.

Iraq is surrounded by Sunni neighbors with significant resources, yet

complaints fall from these neighbors about being left out and about their concerns falling on deaf ears. Many of these countries could do much more to help, and we should encourage them to do so. Even short-term improvements, such as providing electricity from their grids, or supplying diesel fuel—an offer that has been made but is yet unfulfilled by the Saudis—would go a long way.

But we have to do our part and address their legitimate concerns. If we want these nations to step up to the plate and help us to secure Iraq's borders and help, particularly because of their Sunni background, to bring Sunnis into the political process or help to rebuild Iraq's economy and infrastructure, then we have to offer a coherent, strategic security plan for their region. We have to address their fears of an Iran-dominated crescent, and their concerns about our sporadic mediation between Israel and the Palestinians. This administration needs to show it understands there has to be some give-and-take in the process.

The administration could also give a significant boost to the rebuilding effort by recognizing the great untapped potential of private sector contributions. The conference that just took place in Brussels was a donor conference. What we need is more than donors; we need investment. The administration, working with the Iraqi Government, should organize a development conference for Iraqi businessmen and their regional counterparts who wish to invest in Iraq. Regional investment would not only strengthen Iraq's economy, it would give neighboring governments a greater stake in Iraq's success and another incentive for them to be able to provide more help. And the administration might want to consider the effect on regional businessmen when they read headlines about Halliburton's extraordinary dominance of local contracts.

Much of what I have discussed today—from administration mistakes, to the steps we need to move forward—all deals with laying the groundwork for long-term success. But the reality is, the elections are 6 months off. Iraq is not going to be rebuilt overnight, and it is going to take time to get the Iraqi troops ready.

In the coming months, even with perfect planning, there will be violence, turmoil, and hardship. That is why tonight it is critical that President Bush make clear there are actions we can take in the short term to ease the burden on our troops. He needs to get this right, not only to save American lives, but to elevate the confidence of the American people. For this to happen, the President must reconsider some hastily brushed aside options.

To date, the administration has been unwilling to entertain the idea of empowered militias, instead singularly focusing on a unified Iraqi security force. But Iraq, like Afghanistan, has numerous tribal, religious, and ethnic mili-

tias, such as the Kurdish Peshmerga or the Shiite Badr Army.

The fact is, these forces are structured, and, most importantly, they are accepted by the provincial populations. They are capable of providing protection while helping with reconstruction. In the interim, while a fully capable Iraqi security force is established, these forces could meet some of the critical security needs. They could fill the gap. If they can help do the job, why not let them?

It is time for the administration to put aside its concerns and prod the Iraqi Government to give the militias legitimacy. We can do this by integrating them into a kind of national guard, a force that would provide security in their own areas where they are respected and accepted.

The administration also needs to get it right on border security. For 2 years now, Senators and others have been commenting on the absence of adequate border security. The jihadists have been able to move in at will. If we want to ease the burden on our troops in the short term, we need to put that kind of adequate border security force in place. The truth is, it has been absent since day one, which is a shame, because that is precisely where our allies could help.

As opposed to providing security in urban areas, border security is generally much less risky for troops. The administration needs to work with the Iraqi Government to reach out to the world and establish a multinational force to secure Iraq's borders. Such a force, if sanctioned by the U.N. Security Council, could attract participation by Iraq's neighbors and powerful nations with a vested interest, such as India.

The administration has narrowed our options in Iraq, but there are still better choices available to us. There is still time to get it right in Iraq, and I hope, for the sake of our troops, the President will do so tonight.

We are at a critical juncture in this conflict, both at home and abroad. The last thing we need is the administration growing even more stubborn or more defensive. Today, our Nation needs honest, open leadership, and a comprehensive strategy for success. It is time for the President to reach out and work across the aisle and across the globe to clean up this mess.

The President must seize this opportunity to move forward, as the next months are so critical to the future of Iraq and to the future of our security. If the administration fails to take the steps that are available to them, and fails to hold the Iraqis accountable, we will stumble along, our troops at greater risk, casualties rising, the patience of the American people wearing thin, and the specter of quagmire staring us in the face.

Every misstep, every measure untaken, every wise course not followed carries an unbearable cost. The American people have a right to expect

accountability. We need to decrease the risk to our troops and strengthen our chances for success. Our troops deserve better than they are getting. They deserve leadership that is equal to their sacrifice.

BONE MARROW AND CORD BLOOD THERAPY AND RESEARCH ACT OF 2005

Mr. BURR. Mr. President, I rise today to strongly support The Bone Marrow and Cord Blood Therapy and Research Act of 2005. I introduced this legislation with Senators HATCH, DODD, ENSIGN, and REED yesterday and I appreciate their interest in this important legislation.

The Bone Marrow and Cord Blood Therapy and Research Act will help provide adult stem cell transplant material for those patients who need them, and also provide adult stem cells for scientific research.

The House has passed similar legislation and we need to act in a timely matter on this bill. The legislation that we introduced yesterday also reauthorizes the National Marrow Donor Program, an important program helping to provide adult bone marrow to sick individuals. Unfortunately, thousands of Americans have died because there was not an appropriate donor of bone marrow. However, umbilical cord blood may provide an alternative to bone marrow transplantation. Ultimately, given the current limitations of bone marrow transplantation, cord blood could become a more widespread lifesaving therapy.

I am proud of the valuable work and research taking place in North Carolina. In particular, Dr. Joanne Kurtzberg of Duke University, the director of the Pediatric Blood and Marrow Transplant Program, is leading the fight on monumental diseases such as diabetes and Alzheimer's. Dr. Kurtzberg and her team are pioneers in the field, having already performed more than 600 cord blood transplants with unrelated donors more than anyone else in the world.

Cord blood transplantation has already been used to treat a number of diseases including leukemia, lymphoma, and sickle cell anemia. The legislation we introduced yesterday will establish an inventory of 150,000 new cord blood stem cell units that reflects the diversity of the people of the United States. The goal of this legislation is to create a network so that 95 percent of Americans who need a transplant will be able to receive an appropriately matched transplant. Calling transplants the "ultimate in recycling," Dr. Kurtzberg believes, as I do, that cord blood has the potential to save the lives of countless patients nationwide.

The Bone Marrow and Cord Blood Therapy and Research Act establishes a network of qualified cord blood banks to collect, test, and preserve cord blood stem cells. Additionally, this legisla-

tion will help match donors and recipients. I am hopeful that this legislation will provide facilities like the Carolinas Cord Blood Bank at Duke with the ability to save thousands of lives as the number of bone marrow donors and cord blood units increases.

The Senate needs to move forward on this legislation so that the Federal Government can help provide the infrastructure allowing these therapies to be extensively used. I stand ready to work with my colleagues so that we can enact this legislation quickly.

HONORING OUR ARMED FORCES

HONORING ARMY SPECIALIST NICK IDALSKI

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I rise today with a heavy heart and deep sense of gratitude to honor the life of a brave young man from Crown Point. Nick Idalski 23 years old, died on June 21 during combat operations west of Baghdad near Ramadi. With his entire life before him, Nick risked everything to fight for the values Americans hold close to our hearts, in a land halfway around the world.

A 2001 graduate from Crown Point High School, Nick was killed in combat just 1 month before he was scheduled to return home. He had been in the Army for less than 2 years, first being sent to South Korea for a short time before his deployment to Iraq. His family recounted to a local newspaper Nick's passion for being a soldier and helping other people, saying that he died doing something he truly loved. They shared their memories of how selfless, jolly, and determined Nick was, and their pride in him when he decided to join the Army. I stand here today to express the same feelings of pride and gratitude for this young Hoosier's sacrifices and those made by his family on behalf of our country.

Nick was killed while serving his country in Operation Iraqi Freedom. He was a member of the Army's 2nd Infantry Division, and had been stationed in Ramadi since August. This brave young soldier leaves behind his mother and stepfather, Kim and Richard Greenberg; his father, Tony Idalski; his two brothers, Steve and Nathan Idalski; his stepbrother, Kevin Greenberg; two stepsisters; and his longtime girlfriend, Lisa Wheeler.

Today, I join Nick's family and friends in mourning his death. While we struggle to bear our sorrow over this loss, we can also take pride in the example he set, bravely fighting to make the world a safer place. It is his courage and strength of character that people will remember when they think of Nick, a memory that will burn brightly during these continuing days of conflict and grief.

Nick was known for his dedication to his family and his love of country. Today and always, Nick will be remembered by family members, friends and fellow Hoosiers as a true American hero and we honor the sacrifice he made while dutifully serving his country.

As I search for words to do justice in honoring Nick's sacrifice, I am reminded of President Lincoln's remarks as he addressed the families of the fallen soldiers in Gettysburg:

We cannot dedicate, we cannot consecrate, we cannot hallow this ground. The brave men, living and dead, who struggled here, have consecrated it, far above our poor power to add or detract. The world will little note nor long remember what we say here, but it can never forget what they did here.

This statement is just as true today as it was nearly 150 years ago, as I am certain that the impact of Nick's actions will live on far longer than any record of these words.

It is my sad duty to enter the name of Nick Idalski in the official Record of the U.S. Senate for his service to this country and for his profound commitment to freedom, democracy and peace. When I think about this just cause in which we are engaged, and the unfortunate pain that comes with the loss of our heroes, I hope that families like Nick's can find comfort in the words of the prophet Isaiah who said, "He will swallow up death in victory; and the Lord God will wipe away tears from off all faces."

May God grant strength and peace to those who mourn, and may God be with all of you, as I know He is with Nick.

NATIONAL HISTORY DAY PROGRAM

Mr. OBAMA. Mr. President, from June 12-16, 2005, students from the great State of Illinois were invited to Washington, DC, by the National History Day Program to present original history projects. This scholarly group of students used their critical thinking and research skills to create exhibits, documentaries, and performances on the theme, "Communication in History: The Key to Understanding."

Congratulations to the national qualifiers and finalists from Illinois: Audrey Auyeung, Zoe Netter, Charlotte Cook, Eric Jacobson, David Gainski, Lucy Honold, Chelsea Farmer, Brandon Jakub, Kyle Schoenfelt, Dakota Smith, Erich Grundman, Charlie Curran, Jonathan Taub, Alicia Patten, Peter Contos, Honghe Li, Sebastian Prokuski, Laura Muller-Soppart, Tomas Manghi, Elizabeth May, Aruj Chaudhry, Kyle Johnson, Kathryn Evans, Laura Guzman, Rebecca Strauss, Andriy Matyukha, Sean Gallagher, Brendon Gallagher, Dan Burasinsanga, Gian Santos, Mary Kowalkowski, Ellie Terrell, Lauren Brown, Nadine Ibrahim, Annika Kolasa, Courtney Kolbe, Marissa Suchyta, David Bailey, Joseph Tepper, Tamara Vaughn, Stephanie Ebbs, Lena Walker, Maria Carvell, Robby Krajewski, Allyson Schroeder, Elizabeth Hamman, Emily Dennis, Lisa Furby, Katie Damron, Andrea Martinelli, Cristen Sawicki, Kelsey McMahon, Amelia Wallace, Allison Nichols, Sarah Siegel, Eliseo Martinez, and Jessica Drachenberg.